

June 14, 2007

TO: Members of the MAG Enhancement Funds Working Group

FROM: Vice Mayor Michael Johnson, Phoenix, Co-Chair
Ed Beasley, Glendale, Co-Chair

SUBJECT: MEETING NOTIFICATION AND TRANSMITTAL OF TENTATIVE AGENDA

Thursday, June 14, 2007, 2:00 p.m.
MAG Office, Suite 200, Saguaro Room
302 North 1st Avenue, Phoenix

A meeting of the MAG Enhancement Funds Working Group (EFWG) will be held at the time and place noted above. **Please park in the garage under the building. Bring your ticket to the meeting as parking will be validated. Bicycles can be locked in the rack at the entrance to the parking garage.**

Members of the MAG Enhancement Funds Working Group may attend **in person, via videoconference or by telephone conference call**. Those attending by videoconference must notify the MAG office three business days prior to the meeting. Those attending by telephone conference call are requested to call (602) 261-7510 between 1:55 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. on the date of the meeting. After the prompt, please enter the meeting ID number 3394 (EFWG) on the telephone keypad followed by the pound key. If you have a problem or require assistance, dial 0 after calling the number above.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), MAG does not discriminate on the basis of disability in admissions to or participation in its public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting Kevin Wallace at the MAG Office. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

Please be advised that under procedures adopted by the MAG Regional Council on June 26, 1996, all MAG committees need to have a quorum in order to conduct business. A quorum is a simple majority of the membership, or five members of the MAG Enhancement Funds Working Group. If you are unable to attend the meeting, please make arrangements for a proxy from your jurisdiction to represent you. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Kevin Wallace at (602) 254-6300.

TENTATIVE AGENDA

<u>1. Call to Order</u>	<u>COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED</u>
<u>2. Approval of the Draft April 13, 2007 Meeting Minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group</u>	2. Approve Draft minutes of the April 13, 2007 meeting.
<u>3. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience</u> Committee members and audience members will introduce themselves.	3. For information and discussion.
<u>4. Call to the Audience</u> An opportunity will be provided to members of the public to address the Enhancement Funds Working Group on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Enhancement Funds Working Group requests an exception to this limit.	4. For information and discussion.
<u>5. Staff Report</u> MAG Staff will comment on current items of interest.	5. For information and discussion.

ITEMS TO BE HEARD

6. Review and Discussion of Round XV Enhancement Fund Applications

The Working Group will review and discuss the Round XV applications. A summary of applications received is enclosed as **Attachment A**.

Under guidelines adopted by the EFWG on April 6, 2004 (see **Attachment B**), the review will occur as explained below.

- Brief introduction by MAG staff explaining how the application fits into the federal legislation.
- Five minute presentation provided by the applicant that describes the key elements of the project.
- Maximum public comment period of five minutes for each application, following the presentation provided by the applicant.
- Maximum 10 minute question-and-answer period led by EFWG co-chairs.

In addition, applicants are required to submit a written response to comments raised by EFWG members at today's meeting prior to the ranking meeting of the EFWG. The written response should be directed to MAG staff by fax or e-mail by **Wednesday, June 21, 2007, at Noon**.

Applications will be heard in the order received by MAG staff, prior to the June 1, 2007, Noon deadline:

- **Paradise Valley - Tatum Boulevard Southbound Left Turn Lane Extension at Lincoln Drive**
- **Paradise Valley - Lincoln Drive Sidewalk Improvement Project**

6. For information and discussion.

- **Valley Metro/RPTA - Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety Education Plan**
- **Scottsdale - Arizona Canal Multi-Use Path Project: 64th Street to Goldwater Boulevard**
- **Wickenburg - US-60/93 Hassayampa River Bridge Conversion**
- **Avondale - I-10/107th Avenue Underpass Enhancement**
- **Maricopa County - Regional Safe Routes to School Support Center Program**
- **Litchfield Park - Litchfield Park Trails System Landscape Enhancements**
- **Litchfield Park - Litchfield Road and Wigwam Boulevard Pedestrian Underpass and Public Art Project**
- **Mesa - Bike Shelters Along Bicycle Routes Citywide**
- **Glendale - Maryland Avenue Spot Improvements**
- **Surprise - Friendship Bridge Enhancement Design**
- **Surprise - US-60/Grand Avenue Sidewalk Improvements: Sunrise Boulevard to Dysart Road**

7. Other Items Relevant to Round XV and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

The Working Group may discuss other items relevant to this funding cycle and future enhancement fund cycles.

8. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting of the Enhancement Funds Working Group will be held **Friday, June 22, 2006, at 10:30 a.m.** in the MAG Cholla Room. The purpose of this meeting is to rank the enhancement fund applications.

If necessary, a tentative meeting has been scheduled for **Thursday, June 28, 2007, at 1:00 p.m.**

7. For information, discussion and possible action.

8. For Information and Discussion.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS WORKING GROUP

Friday, April 13, 2007 – 1:00 a.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

- | | |
|--|---|
| Councilman Michael Johnson, Co-Chair,
Phoenix | # Robert Schultz, Mesa, representing
the Arts Community |
| * Ed Beasley, Co-Chair, Glendale,
representing the MAG Management
Committee | Dawn Coomer, Scottsdale, representing
the MAG Pedestrian Working Group |
| * Robert Yabes, Tempe, representing the
MAG Street Committee | Bill Lazenby, representing the MAG
Regional Bicycle Task Force |
| Angela Dye, A Dye Design, representing
the American Society of Landscape
Architects, Arizona Chapter | * Doug Kupel, Arizona Preservation
Foundation, representing the
Archaeological and Historic Preservation
Community |

* Not present.

Participated by telephone conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Kevin Wallace, MAG	Ray Dovalina, City of Phoenix
Matthew Hanson, City of Goodyear	Gail Brinkmann, City of Phoenix
Ronnie Stricklin, MCDOT	Mark Young, Town of Queen Creek
Peggy Rubach, MCDOT	Don Homan, Jr., Town of Buckeye
Lynn Timmons, City of Phoenix	

1. Call to Order

Co-Chair Michael Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.

2. Approval of the June 13, 2006, Meeting Minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group

Addressing the first order of business, Co-Chair Johnson asked if there were any changes or amendments to the meeting minutes, and asked for a formal approval. Mr. Bill Lazenby moved to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Angela Dye Lazenby seconded, and the minutes were subsequently approved by unanimous voice vote of the Working Group.

3. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Co-Chair Johnson asked members of the Working Group, and those individuals who were in attendance to introduce themselves. He also noted that Mr. Robert Schultz was attending the meeting via telephone conference call.

4. Call to the Audience

Co-Chair Johnson stated that he had not received any request to speak cards from the audience, and moved to the next item on the Agenda.

5. Staff Report

Co-Chair Johnson introduced Mr. Kevin Wallace, MAG Transit Program Manager, to provide an update on current items of interest. Mr. Wallace provided a summary of the Round XIV Transportation Enhancement funding for the MAG region, included in the Agenda packet as Attachment A. Mr. Wallace noted that the MAG region received five projects, including the following: US-60 Multi-Use Pathway (Town of Wickenburg); Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program (City of Avondale); South Mountain Community College Pedestrian Crossing (City of Phoenix); Grand Canal Pedestrian Pathway (City of Glendale); and Heritage District Downtown Pedestrian Project (Town of Gilbert).

Mr. Wallace then briefed the Working Group on the March 21, 2007, meeting of the Transportation Enhancement Review Committee (TERC). Mr. Wallace distributed a copy of the Arizona Department of Transportation's (ADOT's) Round XV Transportation Enhancement Application, and noted that several minor changes were approved by the TERC at the March 21 meeting. First, the TERC approved new commitment requirements for local government resolutions. Specific items that the resolutions must address include the project sponsor's commitment to provide a 5.7% local match; to commit to advertise the project within three years; to commit to pay for all cost overruns; and to commit to reimburse ADOT for all federal funds used if the project is canceled by the project sponsor. Mr. Wallace then stated that a new optional item for before and after photos is identified in the application, and that the cost estimate spreadsheet now includes a line item for soil stabilization for multi-use paths. Mr. Wallace informed the group that the TERC spent a considerable amount of time discussing the need for better cost estimates, in light of rapidly escalating commodity prices. Suggestions from the TERC for local project sponsors to develop better cost estimates included researching costs with local public works departments, ADOT project managers, ADOT district engineers, and materials suppliers.

Mr. Wallace concluded his report by informing the Working Group that ADOT estimates there will be \$8 million for local projects and \$4 million for state projects as part of Round XV.

Ms. Dawn Coomer asked if the TERC had considered increasing the \$500,000 cap for local enhancement projects, noting that recent cost increases had made it difficult to complete projects for that amount of money. Mr. Wallace responded that he had discussed this issue with ADOT staff, and was told that the TERC voted against raising the project cap at its October 2006 meeting. Co-Chair Johnson

indicated that this would reduce the number of projects funded each year, and that issue had driven recent conversations at the TERC. Co-Chair Johnson also noted that the TERC has set aside part of the annual funding to address cost overruns. Ms. Angela Dye stated that this issue should be revisited in the future, as prices for constructing projects continues to escalate.

6. Schedule for Round XV Transportation Enhancement Funds

Co-Chair Johnson asked Mr. Wallace to update the Working Group on MAG's schedule for the Round XV. Mr. Wallace provided an overview of the Round XV schedule, included with the Agenda packet as Attachment B.

Ms. Dye noted that she would not be able to attend either of the Working Group meetings in June, but would provide her comments and scores in writing.

7. Transportation Enhancement Ranking

Co-Chair Johnson addressed the next order of business by stating that he would like to see if there was a way to make the process more equitable for small cities. As an example, Co-Chair Johnson stated that cities that receive enhancement funds could be required to set out from the application process for one year. Co-Chair Johnson indicated it also might be more effective for the MAG region to limit the number of projects submitted to the TERC. Co-Chair Johnson then referred the Working Group to a letter from Mr. Doug Kupel, who was in favor of funding more historic preservation projects in the future.

Mr. Bill Lazenby indicated that he's heard that some cities don't have the funds to provide the required 5.7% match. Ms. Coomer stated that the 5.7% match wasn't the primary issue, rather, that \$500,000 doesn't go very far, and that it's a big issue for the TERC when a project has a very high local match, because it looks like you don't need the enhancement money.

Discussion ensued, and Mr. Robert Schultz said that one option would be to rank the highest rated small city project as the region's number two priority, regardless of how it rated otherwise. Ms. Dye asked Mr. Schultz how the Working Group would decide what constituted a small city. Mr. Schultz stated that he had not researched the issue, but that 100,000 might be a logical cut-off, and suggested that MAG staff research the League of Cities definition of a small city. Ms. Coomer stated that her impression was that small cities were doing pretty well with the enhancement program, particularly over the last year or two. Co-Chair Johnson stated that he would like to involve more small cities in the program, and noted that the TERC was very impressed with the City of Avondale's bicycle education project.

Ms. Coomer asked if MAG staff had been contacted by small cities that were concerned with the current process. Mr. Wallace stated that since he had been coordinating the program over the last two months, he had not been contacted on this issue. Ms. Dye then noted that a significant issue for the smaller cities is that they typically aren't self administered, which makes the ADOT project development process even longer.

Co-Chair Johnson stated that it was clear to him that there was no clear direction on changing the current process at this time. He indicated that he would discussions on this topic. Co-Chair Johnson indicated

that the Working Group and MAG staff would continue to work toward increasing the project cap.

Ms. Coomer suggested that MAG staff stress at the April 27 application workshop that there are two processes for the enhancement program. The MAG process may be intimidating for some of the smaller cities, but there is still an opportunity for the small cities to get their projects funded through the state process. Mr. Wallace indicated that he would make note of that issue at the application workshop.

8. Future Meeting Dates

Co-Chair Johnson stated the next meeting of the MAG Enhancement Funds Working Group was scheduled for June 14, 2007, at 2:00 p.m. in the MAG Saguaro Room. There being no comments or questions, Co-Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 1:39 p.m.

Round XV Transportation Enhancement Fund Applications - MAG

June 1, 2007

Note: Projects Are Listed in the Order Received by MAG Staff

APPLICAN T	TYP E	LOCAL MATCH (%)	FED. AMT. (LOCAL PROJ.)	FED. AMT. (STATE PROJ.)	TOTAL PROJ. AMT.	DESCRIPTION
Paradise Valley	Local	\$21,902 (5.7%)	\$362,348		\$384,250	Tatum Boulevard Southbound Left Turn Lane Extension at Lincoln Drive - Extend the left turn lane on Tatum Boulevard for southbound traffic turning east on Lincoln Drive. The length of the project is approximately 1/16 th of a mile. The shortening and partial re-landscaping of the existing median island is required.
Paradise Valley	Local	\$131,675 (20.9%)	\$500,000		\$631,675	Lincoln Drive Sidewalk Improvement Project - Construction of a 6-foot wide concrete sidewalk along the south side of Lincoln Drive between Invergordon Road and the eastern Town limits just west of Scottsdale Road. Re-construct all driveways and intersection access ramps to ADA compliance, plant landscaping adjacent to sidewalk for beautification.
Valley Metro/RPTA	Local	\$57,424 (10.8%)	\$475,000		\$532,424	Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Safety Education Program - Increase the awareness and implementation of safety practices with a goal to reduce the number of bicycle and pedestrian-related crashes and fatalities. This program is aimed at bicyclists and pedestrians, as well as motorists.
Scottsdale	Local	\$351,864 (41.3%)	\$500,000		\$851,864	Arizona Canal Multi-Use Path Project: 64th Street to Goldwater Boulevard - Construct a 10-foot to 12-foot multiuse path along the south bank of the Arizona Canal from 64 th Street to Goldwater Boulevard, an approximate distance of 0.9 miles. The project will include landscaping, site furnishings and locally funded artist involvement.
Wickenburg	Local	\$12,092 (5.7%)	\$200,046		\$212,138	US-60/93 Hassayampa River Bridge Conversion - The project concept is to revitalize the Historic Downtown Wickenburg area by converting an existing US-60 bridge across the Hassayampa River (constructed in 1962) into pedestrian crosswalk and event venue. The project will also restore the existing historically eligible railroad underpass constructed in 1937.
Avondale	Local	\$194,404 (28.0%)	\$500,000		\$694,404	I-10/107th Avenue Underpass Enhancement - The project will widen the existing I-10/107th Avenue underpass concurrently with ADOT's upcoming freeway widening project. The project will promote walking and biking through the provision of bike lanes, sidewalks, lighting and artistic visual elements.

Round XV Transportation Enhancement Fund Applications - MAG

June 1, 2007

Note: Projects Are Listed in the Order Received by MAG Staff

APPLICANT	TYPE	LOCAL MATCH (%)	FED. AMT. (LOCAL PROJ.)	FED. AMT. (STATE PROJ.)	TOTAL PROJ. AMT.	DESCRIPTION
Maricopa County	Local	\$28,500 (6.9%)	\$391,135		\$414,777	Regional Safe Routes to School Support Center Project - Provide integrated programs to develop safe routes for children to walk and bike to school and instill in students lifelong skills regarding healthy and active life choices, traffic safety and travel injury prevention.
Litchfield Park	Local	\$8,966 (5.7%)	\$148,334		\$157,300	Litchfield Park Trails System Landscape Enhancements - This project will consist of enhancements to beautify two areas of the trail system that stand out as being notably barren. Landscape improvements will include trees, shrubs and cactus. Decomposed granite, a drip irrigation system, 10 benches and 10 trash receptacles will also be installed.
Litchfield Park	Local	\$1,520,403 (75.3%)	\$500,000		\$2,020,403	Litchfield Road and Wigwam Boulevard Pedestrian Underpass and Public Art Project - The project will provide a 12-foot wide pathway under the existing grade of Litchfield Road, providing a critical link in the existing 12-mile pedestrian and bicycle corridor. Artistic features will be incorporated into all structural components both within the underpass area and along the ramps.
Mesa	Local	\$27,182 (5.7%)	\$449,693		\$476,875	Bike Shelters Along Bicycle Routes Citywide - Construct shelters at 15 locations along existing bicycle routes and existing or proposed shared-use pathways. Each shelter will include no less than 120 square feet of roof area with two benches, four bicycle racks and a drinking fountain.
Glendale	Local	\$10,036 (5.7%)	\$166,039		\$176,076	Maryland Avenue Spot Improvements - The project will add additional asphalt for bike lanes where Maryland Avenue is too narrow and build short multi-use path segments to tie Maryland Avenue into existing pathways in Discovery Park.
Surprise	Local	\$25,000 (7.5%)	\$310,000		\$335,000	Friendship Bridge Enhancement Design - The project will enhance, light, and beautify the 1,200 linear foot Friendship Bridge that is located on the eastern border of the City of Surprise along Bell Road crossing the Agua Fria River.

ATTACHMENT B

APPLICAN T	TYP E	LOCAL MATCH (%)	FED. AMT. (LOCAL PROJ.)	FED. AMT. (STATE PROJ.)	TOTAL PROJ. AMT.	DESCRIPTION
Surprise	State	\$60,443 (5.7%)		\$999,957	\$1,060,400	US-60/Grand Avenue Sidewalk Improvements: Sunrise Boulevard to Dysart Road - The project will provide three miles of sidewalks and associated landscaping on the south side of US-60 (Grand Avenue) between Sunrise Boulevard and Dysart Road.
TOTAL			\$6,192,783	\$999,957		

MAG Enhancement Funds Working Group
Process for Review and Ranking of Applications¹

- I. Each enhancement fund cycle, three meetings of the EFWG are scheduled to review and rank applications. The first meeting focuses on reviewing applications. Applicants may be asked questions about their application and may be asked to make changes to their application based on the expertise of the EFWG. The second meeting provides for additional review of applications (if needed), discussion of issues or questions raised regarding applications at the first meeting, and ranking of applications. A third meeting is scheduled, if necessary, to allow additional opportunity for application ranking.
- II. A list showing the order that applications will be reviewed at the EFWG meetings is provided on the EFWG agenda. Providing the list allows applicants to make the best use of their time in attending EFWG meetings. The applications will be reviewed in the order received by MAG staff.
- III. The review of applications occurs as follows:
 - A. Brief introduction by MAG staff explaining how the application fits into the federal legislation.
 - B. Five minute presentation provided by the applicant.
 - C. Maximum public comment period of five minutes for each application, following the presentation provided by the applicant.
 - D. 10 minute question-and-answer period led by EFWG co-chairs.
 - E. Applicants are required to submit a written response to comments raised by EFWG members prior to the next meeting. The written response should be directed to MAG staff.
- IV. Meetings of the Enhancement Funds Working Group provide two opportunities for public comment: during the “call to the audience” and on each action item. During the Call to the Audience, speakers have three minutes to provide comment on any nonagenda item that is within the jurisdiction of MAG, as well as any nonaction agenda item. This opportunity is generally held at the beginning of the meeting prior to any other actions.

In addition, speakers are given three minutes to speak on any action item (three minutes per item). If a speaker does not believe he/she can adequately cover their concerns in the three-minute time frame, written comments are always accepted. The Chair has the discretion to extend or limit citizen comment periods. However, the discretion to limit public comment should be exercised cautiously and implemented only in cases in which

¹ This guidance was originally adopted by the Enhancement Funds Working Group on March 22, 2002 and was revised on April 6, 2004.

the work of the body would be jeopardized by allowing citizen comment (i.e., if the committee is in imminent danger of losing a quorum).

The Chair has the power to enforce the speaking rules, as outlined on the MAG comment cards, and to revoke speaking rights if any violation of the speaking rules occurs. The Chair may revoke an individual's rights to speak if the individual twice refuses to be silent after being directed to do so. (If an individual loses the right to speak, he/she may still present written comments.)

- V. To rank applications:
 - A. Committee members anonymously complete ballots provided by MAG staff.
 - B. MAG staff compiles and calculates initial rankings. A brief break in the meeting is typically called to allow time for the calculations.
 - C. EFWG discusses initial ranking with no additional opportunity for public input. Note that an opportunity for public input is provided before committee discussion of the ranking item.
- VI. To address the issue of multiple applications submitted by one member agency, each member agency submitting more than one application is requested to submit a letter to MAG staff indicating the priority ranking of the projects submitted. This information is ***not required***.